



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,382	07/02/2001	Hiromi Ohtaki	210213US0	1400

22850 7590 09/23/2002

OBLON SPIVAK MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT PC
FOURTH FLOOR
1755 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER

KERR, KATHLEEN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1652

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2002 10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/895,382

Applicant(s)

OHTAKI ET AL.

Examiner

Kathleen M Kerr

Art Unit

1652

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Application Status

1. Claims 1-9 are pending in the instant application.

Restriction

2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121:
 - I. Claims 1-4, drawn to coryneform bacteria with decreased trehalose synthesis ability, classified in class 435, subclass 252.32.
 - II. Claim 5, drawn to methods for producing L-glutamic acid, classified in class 435, subclass 110.
 - III. Claims 6-7, drawn to DNA encoding trehalose-6-phosphate synthase, classified in class 536, subclass 23.2.
 - IV. Claims 8-9, drawn to DNA encoding maltooligosyltrehalose synthase, classified in class 536, subclass 23.2.

3. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Groups I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (M.P.E.P. § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the coryneform bacteria can be used in a materially different process of using that product, such as in the production of amino acids other than glutamate, for

Art Unit: 1652

example, threonine. Thus, Groups I and II are patentably distinct. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

A species of Group I (specific to mutation of the chromosomal trehalose-6-phosphate synthase gene) is related to Group III by virtue of the DNA mutated in Group I. However, these Groups are distinct because of their distinct structures that extend to their distinct functions. Group I is the absence of a gene encoding a functional trehalose-6-phosphate synthase while Group III is the present of said gene. Thus, Groups I and III are patentably distinct. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group III, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

A species of Group I (specific to mutation of the chromosomal maltotriose-6-phosphate synthase gene) is related to Group IV by virtue of the DNA mutated in Group I. However, these Groups are distinct because of their distinct structures that extend to their distinct functions. Group I is the absence of a gene encoding a maltotriose-6-phosphate synthase while Group IV is the present of said gene. Thus, Groups I and IV are patentably distinct. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group IV, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Group II is not related to Groups III and IV. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (M.P.E.P. § 806.04, M.P.E.P. § 808.01). In the instant case, the different inventions are structurally distinct since the methods of Group II utilize coryneform cells with the absence of genes encoding either trehalose-6-phosphate synthase or

Art Unit: 1652

maltooligosyltrehalose synthase while Groups III and IV are the presence of said genes, respectively. Thus, Group II is patentably distinct from Groups III and IV. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group II is not required for Groups II and IV, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Groups III and IV are related as genes encoding enzymes involved in trehalose biosynthesis. However, these Groups are distinct because they are both structurally and functionally distinct. The DNA of Group III is entirely structurally dissimilar to the DNA of Group IV; moreover, no homology is described in the specification. The trehalose-6-phosphate synthase encoded by the DNA of Group III is functionally unrelated to the maltooligosyltrehalose synthase encoded by the DNA of Group IV; the enzymes are entirely distinct having different substrates and products and catalyzing distinct chemical reactions. Thus, Groups III and IV are patentably distinct. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group III is not required for Group IV, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Notice of Possible Rejoinder

4. The Examiner notes that if product claims in Group I are found directed to an allowable product, then process claims in Group II, which are directed to processes of using the patentable product, previously withdrawn from consideration as a result of a restriction requirement, would now be rejoined pursuant to the procedures set forth in the Official Gazette notice dated March 26, 1996 (1184 O.G. 86; see also M.P.E.P. § 821.04, *In re Ochiai*, and *In re Brouwer*). Since process claims would be rejoined and fully examined for patentability under 37 C.F.R. § 1.104,

Art Unit: 1652

Applicants are instructed to amend said claims as deemed necessary according to rejections made against the elected claims.

Election of Species

5. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: in Group I, the mutation of trehalose-6-phosphate synthase and the mutation of maltooligosyltrehalose synthase are distinct species.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, Claims 1 and 2 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 C.F.R. § 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. M.P.E.P. § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the

Art Unit: 1652

examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of the other invention.

Election

6. A telephone call was made to John Pike on September 20, 2002 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 C.F.R. § 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(i).

Conclusion

7. A complete response to the instant Office action must include an election of invention. If Group I is elected, an election of species must also be made for the response to be complete.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kathleen M Kerr whose telephone number is (703) 305-1229.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, from 8:30am to 5pm.

Application/Control Number: 09/895,382
Art Unit: 1652

Page 7

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ponnathupura Achutamurthy can be reached on (703) 308-3804. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-0294 for regular communications and (703) 305-3014 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

KMK
September 20, 2002

